

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JOHNSON, BRIAN VAN NESS, TRUSTEE
BRIAN VAN NESS JOHNSON TRUST #87-83-
4504,

Plaintiff,

-against-

RICHARD W. VERCOLLINE (TOWN
JUSTICE); ADA CARPENTER (ADA TOWN
OF SOUTHEAST); SHANE ROSSITER
(PUTNAM COUNTY SHERIFF); KARINE
PETINO (PUBLIC DEFENDER PUTNAM
COUNTY),

Defendants.

23-CV-7092 (LTS)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN, Chief United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, who is appearing *pro se*, brings this action concerning his state court proceedings in Putnam County, New York. By order dated August 14, 2023, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* ("IFP"), that is, without prepayment of fees. For the following reasons, the Court dismisses the complaint, with 30 days' leave to file an amended complaint that does not exceed 20 pages.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Court must dismiss an IFP complaint, or any portion of the complaint, that is frivolous or malicious, fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); *see Livingston v. Adirondack Beverage Co.*, 141 F.3d 434, 437 (2d Cir. 1998). The Court must also dismiss a complaint when the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction of the claims raised. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).*

While the law mandates dismissal on any of these grounds, the Court is obliged to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally, *Harris v. Mills*, 572 F.3d 66, 72 (2d Cir. 2009), and interpret them to raise the “strongest [claims] that they suggest,” *Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F.3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted) (emphasis in original). But the “special solicitude” in *pro se* cases, *id.* at 475 (citation omitted), has its limits – to state a claim, *pro se* pleadings still must comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which requires a complaint to make a short and plain statement showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.

Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires a complaint to include enough facts to state a claim for relief “that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). A claim is facially plausible if the plaintiff pleads enough factual detail to allow the Court to draw the inference that the defendant is liable for the alleged misconduct. In reviewing the complaint, the Court must accept all well-pleaded factual allegations as true. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009). But it does not have to accept as true “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action,” which are essentially just legal conclusions. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. After separating legal conclusions from well-pleaded factual allegations, the Court must determine whether those facts make it plausible – not merely possible – that the pleader is entitled to relief. *Id.*

BACKGROUND

Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and his trust, the Brian Van Ness Johnson Trust (the “Trust”). The action appears to concern two state court matters pending in Southeast Town Court in Putnam County, New York. Plaintiff names as Defendants Town Justice Richard Vercollone, Assistant District Attorney (“ADA”) Carpenter, Putnam County Sheriff Shane Rossiter, and Putnam County Public Defender Karine Petino. Plaintiff has submitted a

complaint, in which he includes this court's complaint form, but he does not complete the form. Rather, he attaches 182 pages of documents, many of which do not appear to concern his claims against the named Defendants. The following facts are drawn from the attachments that relate to Plaintiff's state court matters.

The first document attached to the complaint is an April 10, 2023 court document captioned for a Town of Southeast, Putnam County court, titled "affidavit in support of motion." In what appears to be an ongoing state matter, Plaintiff has sued three of the same Defendants sued in this action, that is, Town Justice Vercollone, Sheriff Rossiter, and "Putnam Legal Aid Society Officer," which the Court understands to be Public Defender Petino. The affidavit concerns the ownership of four vehicles; Plaintiff states that he "does not own a 2005 Silver Chevy Suburban . . . a 1994 Black GMC Suburban . . . a 2005 Silver Chevy Suburban . . . [or] a 1994 Back GMC Suburban." (ECF 1, at 9.) Plaintiff, who refers to himself in the affidavit as "[t]he aggrieved Defendant" (*id.* at 10), also states he

never received a ticket on 12/03/1997 with supposed order # T221863 for failure to answer summons. Nor did Affiant ever get via mail or in person any summons, or tickets from anyone in reference to [eight tickets]." (*Id.*) Plaintiff asks the Putnam County court to "dismiss the case sua sponte . . . and to provide factual evidence of jurisdiction of the charges to the court over the parties, and want of a qualified witness to the facts of the matters before the court.

(*Id.*)

The remaining documents do not appear to relate to the Putnam County court proceeding or the named Defendants. Several of the documents concern Plaintiff's trust. Plaintiff does not detail any injuries he sustained or the relief he seeks. Although Plaintiff directs the Court to his attached documents for this information, the Court is unable to locate any attachments to the complaint relevant to his injuries or the type of relief he seeks.

DISCUSSION

A. Proceeding *Pro Se* on Behalf of a Trust

Corporations, nonprofit organizations, and other artificial entities cannot proceed *pro se*.

Rowland v. Cal. Men's Colony, Unit II Men's Advisory Council, 506 U.S. 194, 202 (1993)

(noting that “lower courts have uniformly held that 28 U.S.C. § 1654, providing that “parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel,” does not allow corporations, partnerships, or associations to appear in federal court otherwise than through a licensed attorney”) (citations omitted); *see also Jones v. Niagara Frontier Transp. Auth.*, 722 F.2d 20, 22 (2d Cir. 1983) (noting that “it is established that a corporation, which is an artificial entity that can only act through agents, cannot proceed *pro se*”). “A trust is deemed an artificial entity for the purposes of the rule barring a nonlawyer trustee from representing the interests of the trust.” *Bell v. S. Bay Eur. Corp.*, 486 F. Supp. 2d 257, 259 (S.D.N.Y. 2007). Thus, the claims brought on behalf of the Trust are dismissed without prejudice to the Trust retaining counsel and initiating its own action.

B. Section 1983

Plaintiff brings claims against a town justice, an ADA, a sheriff, and a public defender, and refers to criminal proceedings that may be ongoing. Inasmuch as Plaintiff seeks relief from the named state actors, the Court construes the complaint as arising under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. To state a claim under Section 1983, a plaintiff must allege both that: (1) a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) the right was violated by a person acting under the color of state law, or a “state actor.” *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48-49 (1988).

1. Judicial Immunity

The complaint suggests that Plaintiff seeks relief under Section 1983 against Town Justice Vercollone based on this defendant’s role in Plaintiff’s state court matter. Judges are

absolutely immune, however, from suit for damages for any actions taken within the scope of their judicial responsibilities. *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9, 11 (1991). Generally, “acts arising out of, or related to, individual cases before the judge are considered judicial in nature.” *Bliven v. Hunt*, 579 F.3d 204, 210 (2d Cir. 2009). “Even allegations of bad faith or malice cannot overcome judicial immunity.” *Id.* (citations omitted). This is because, “[w]ithout insulation from liability, judges would be subject to harassment and intimidation” *Young v. Selsky*, 41 F.3d 47, 51 (2d Cir. 1994). In addition, Section 1983, as amended in 1996, provides that “in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer’s judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable.” 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Judicial immunity does not apply when the judge takes action “outside” his judicial capacity, or when the judge takes action that, although judicial in nature, is taken “in absence of jurisdiction.” *Mireles*, 502 U.S. at 9-10; *see also Bliven*, 579 F.3d at 209-10 (describing actions that are judicial in nature). But “the scope of [a] judge’s jurisdiction must be construed broadly where the issue is the immunity of the judge.” *Stump v. Sparkman*, 435 U.S. 349, 356 (1978).

Plaintiff fails to allege any facts suggesting that Town Justice Vercollone acted beyond the scope of his judicial responsibilities or outside his jurisdiction. *See Mireles*, 509 U.S. at 11-12. Because Plaintiff sues this Defendant for “acts arising out of, or related to, individual cases before him,” he is immune from suit for such claims. *Bliven*, 579 F.3d at 210. The Court therefore dismisses Plaintiff’s claims against Justice Vercollone because they seek monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(iii), and, consequently, as frivolous, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). *See Mills v. Fischer*, 645 F.3d 176, 177

(2d Cir. 2011) (“Any claim dismissed on the ground of absolute judicial immunity is ‘frivolous’ for purposes of [the in forma pauperis statute].”).

2. Prosecutorial Immunity

The Court understands the complaint as seeking relief against ADA Carpenter for her role in Plaintiff’s criminal proceedings.¹ Like judges, prosecutors also are immune from civil suits for damages for acts committed within the scope of their official duties where the challenged activities are not investigative in nature but, rather, are ““intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process.”” *Giraldo v. Kessler*, 694 F.3d 161, 165 (2d Cir. 2012) (quoting *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 430 (1976)); *see also Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259, 269 (1993) (absolute immunity is analyzed under a “functional approach” that “looks to the nature of the function performed, not the identity of the actor who performed it” (internal quotation marks and citations omitted)). In addition, prosecutors are absolutely immune from suit for acts that may be administrative obligations but are “directly connected with the conduct of a trial.” *Van de Kamp v. Goldstein*, 555 U.S. 335, 344 (2009); *see also Ogunkoya v. Monaghan*, 913 F.3d 64, 70-72 (2d Cir. 2019) (holding that ADAs’ direction as to where criminal defendant would be arraigned was in preparation for a court proceeding in which the prosecutors were acting as advocates, and ADAs were therefore shielded by absolute immunity) (citing, *inter alia*, *Van de Kamp*).

Here, Plaintiff’s claims against ADA Carpenter are based on actions within the scope of her official duties and associated with Plaintiff’s criminal proceedings. Therefore, these claims are dismissed because they seek monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such

¹ Plaintiff does not identify ADA Carpenter’s gender. The Court uses she/her pronouns for this defendant.

relief, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(b)(iii), and, consequently, as frivolous, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i). *See Collazo v. Pagano*, 656 F. 3d 131, 134 (2d Cir. 2011) (holding that claim against prosecutor is frivolous if it arises from conduct that is “intimately associated with the judicial phase of the criminal process”).

3. Private Parties

A claim for relief under Section 1983 must allege facts suggesting that each defendant acted under the color of a state “statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage.” 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Thus, private parties generally are not liable under the statute. *Sykes v. Bank of Am.*, 723 F.3d 399, 406 (2d Cir. 2013) (citing *Brentwood Acad. v. Tenn. Secondary Sch. Athletic Ass’n*, 531 U.S. 288, 295 (2001)); *see also Ciambriello v. Cnty. of Nassau*, 292 F.3d 307, 323 (2d Cir. 2002) (“[T]he United States Constitution regulates only the Government, not private parties.”). Absent special circumstances suggesting concerted action between an attorney and a state representative, *see Nicholas v. Goord*, 430 F.3d 652, 656 n.7 (2d Cir. 2005) (citing *Adickes v. S.H. Kress & Co.*, 398 U.S. 144, 152 (1970)), the representation of a defendant by private counsel in state criminal proceedings does not constitute the degree of state involvement or interference necessary to establish a claim under Section 1983, regardless of whether that attorney is privately retained, court-appointed, or employed as a public defender. *See Bourdon v. Loughren*, 386 F.3d 88, 90 (2d Cir. 2004) (citing *Polk Cnty. v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 324-25 (1981)); *see also Schnabel v. Abramson*, 232 F.3d 83, 87 (2d Cir. 2000) (holding that legal aid organization ordinarily is not a state actor for purposes of § 1983).

Here, Plaintiff names as a defendant Karine Petino, a Putnam County public defender, who presumably represented Plaintiff in his criminal proceedings. As this defendant is a private party who is not alleged to work for any state or other government body, Plaintiff has not stated a

claim against Petino under Section 1983. Any such claims Plaintiff may be asserting against Petino are dismissed for failure to state a claim. *See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(b)(ii).*

4. Personal Involvement

Plaintiff names as a defendant Putnam County Sheriff Rossiter but does not allege any facts suggesting his personal involvement in any conduct affecting Plaintiff. To state a claim under Section 1983, a plaintiff must allege facts showing the defendants' direct and personal involvement in the alleged constitutional deprivation. *See Spavone v. N.Y. State Dep't of Corr. Serv.*, 719 F.3d 127, 135 (2d Cir. 2013) ("It is well settled in this Circuit that personal involvement of defendants in the alleged constitutional deprivations is a prerequisite to an award of damages under § 1983." (internal quotation marks omitted)). A defendant may not be held liable under § 1983 solely because that defendant employs or supervises a person who violated the plaintiff's rights. *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 676 (2009) ("Government officials may not be held liable for the unconstitutional conduct of their subordinates under a theory of respondeat superior."). Rather, "[t]o hold a state official liable under § 1983, a plaintiff must plead and prove the elements of the underlying constitutional violation directly against the official[.]" *Tangreti v. Bachmann*, 983 F.3d 609, 620 (2d Cir. 2020).

Plaintiff does not allege any facts showing how the Putnam County Sheriff was personally involved in any event underlying any claim Plaintiff may be asserting. Thus, the Court dismisses any claims asserted against Sheriff Rossiter for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted. *See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).*

C. Supplemental Jurisdiction

A district court may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction of state-law claims when it "has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction." 28 U.S.C. § 1337(c)(3). Generally, "when the federal-law claims have dropped out of the lawsuit in its early stages and

only state-law claims remain, the federal court should decline the exercise of jurisdiction.”

Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill, 484 U.S. 343, 350 n.7 (1988). Having dismissed the federal claims of which the Court has original jurisdiction, the Court declines to exercise its supplemental jurisdiction of any state law claims Plaintiff may be asserting. *See Kolari v. New York-Presbyterian Hosp.*, 455 F.3d 118, 122 (2d Cir. 2006) (“Subsection (c) of § 1367 ‘confirms the discretionary nature of supplemental jurisdiction by enumerating the circumstances in which district courts can refuse its exercise.’” (quoting *City of Chicago v. Int’l Coll. of Surgeons*, 522 U.S. 156, 173 (1997))).

D. Leave to Amend

Plaintiff proceeds in this matter without the benefit of an attorney. District courts generally should grant a self-represented plaintiff an opportunity to amend a complaint to cure its defects, unless amendment would be futile. *See Hill v. Curcione*, 657 F.3d 116, 123-24 (2d Cir. 2011); *Salahuddin v. Cuomo*, 861 F.2d 40, 42 (2d Cir. 1988). Indeed, the Second Circuit has cautioned that district courts “should not dismiss [a *pro se* complaint] without granting leave to amend at least once when a liberal reading of the complaint gives any indication that a valid claim might be stated.” *Cuoco v. Moritsugu*, 222 F.3d 99, 112 (2d Cir. 2000) (quoting *Gomez v. USAA Fed. Sav. Bank*, 171 F.3d 794, 795 (2d Cir. 1999)).

The Court has dismissed this complaint because Plaintiff (1) sues Defendants who are immune from liability in a Section 1983 action, (2) cannot assert Section 1983 claims against a private party, and (3) does not provide sufficient facts to suggest that the Putnam County Sheriff was personally involved in any conduct. Because Plaintiff may be able to allege additional facts to state a valid claim against the Putnam County Sheriff, the Court grants Plaintiff 30 days’ leave to file amended complaint against Sheriff Rossiter that does not exceed 20 pages.

E. New York Legal Assistance Group

Plaintiff may consider contacting the New York Legal Assistance Group's ("NYLAG") Clinic for Pro Se Litigants in the Southern District of New York, which is a free legal clinic staffed by attorneys and paralegals to assist those who are representing themselves in civil lawsuits in this court. The clinic is run by a private organization; it is not part of, or run by, the court. It cannot accept filings on behalf of the court, which must still be made by any *pro se* party through the Pro Se Intake Unit. A copy of the flyer with details of the clinic is attached to this order.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's complaint, filed IFP under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(iii), with 30 days leave to file an amended complaint that does not exceed 20 pages.

An Amended Complaint form and a copy of NYLAG's flyer with details of its clinic is attached to this order.

The Court declines to exercise its supplemental jurisdiction of any state law claims Plaintiff may be asserting.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppededge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 6, 2023
New York, New York

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain
LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN
Chief United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Write the full name of each plaintiff.

CV _____
(Include case number if one has been assigned)

-against-

AMENDED

COMPLAINT

Do you want a jury trial?

Yes No

Write the full name of each defendant. If you need more space, please write "see attached" in the space above and attach an additional sheet of paper with the full list of names. The names listed above must be identical to those contained in Section II.

NOTICE

The public can access electronic court files. For privacy and security reasons, papers filed with the court should therefore *not* contain: an individual's full social security number or full birth date; the full name of a person known to be a minor; or a complete financial account number. A filing may include *only*: the last four digits of a social security number; the year of an individual's birth; a minor's initials; and the last four digits of a financial account number. See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2.

I. BASIS FOR JURISDICTION

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction (limited power). Generally, only two types of cases can be heard in federal court: cases involving a federal question and cases involving diversity of citizenship of the parties. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, a case arising under the United States Constitution or federal laws or treaties is a federal question case. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1332, a case in which a citizen of one State sues a citizen of another State or nation, and the amount in controversy is more than \$75,000, is a diversity case. In a diversity case, no defendant may be a citizen of the same State as any plaintiff.

What is the basis for federal-court jurisdiction in your case?

- Federal Question**
- Diversity of Citizenship**

A. If you checked Federal Question

Which of your federal constitutional or federal statutory rights have been violated?

B. If you checked Diversity of Citizenship

1. Citizenship of the parties

Of what State is each party a citizen?

The plaintiff, _____, is a citizen of the State of
(Plaintiff's name)

(State in which the person resides and intends to remain.)

or, if not lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States, a citizen or subject of the foreign state of _____.

If more than one plaintiff is named in the complaint, attach additional pages providing information for each additional plaintiff.

If the defendant is an individual:

The defendant, _____, is a citizen of the State of
(Defendant's name)

or, if not lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States, a citizen or subject of the foreign state of

If the defendant is a corporation:

The defendant, _____, is incorporated under the laws of
the State of _____

and has its principal place of business in the State of _____
or is incorporated under the laws of (foreign state) _____

and has its principal place of business in _____.

If more than one defendant is named in the complaint, attach additional pages providing information for each additional defendant.

II. PARTIES

A. Plaintiff Information

Provide the following information for each plaintiff named in the complaint. Attach additional pages if needed.

| | | |
|------------|----------------|-----------|
| First Name | Middle Initial | Last Name |
|------------|----------------|-----------|

| |
|----------------|
| Street Address |
|----------------|

| | | |
|--------------|-------|----------|
| County, City | State | Zip Code |
|--------------|-------|----------|

| | |
|------------------|------------------------------|
| Telephone Number | Email Address (if available) |
|------------------|------------------------------|

B. Defendant Information

To the best of your ability, provide addresses where each defendant may be served. If the correct information is not provided, it could delay or prevent service of the complaint on the defendant. Make sure that the defendants listed below are the same as those listed in the caption. Attach additional pages if needed.

Defendant 1:

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| First Name | Last Name | |
| Current Job Title (or other identifying information) | | |
| Current Work Address (or other address where defendant may be served) | | |
| County, City | State | Zip Code |

Defendant 2:

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| First Name | Last Name | |
| Current Job Title (or other identifying information) | | |
| Current Work Address (or other address where defendant may be served) | | |
| County, City | State | Zip Code |

Defendant 3:

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| First Name | Last Name | |
| Current Job Title (or other identifying information) | | |
| Current Work Address (or other address where defendant may be served) | | |
| County, City | State | Zip Code |

Defendant 4:

| | |
|------------|-----------|
| First Name | Last Name |
|------------|-----------|

Current Job Title (or other identifying information)

Current Work Address (or other address where defendant may be served)

| | | |
|--------------|-------|----------|
| County, City | State | Zip Code |
|--------------|-------|----------|

III. STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Place(s) of occurrence: _____

Date(s) of occurrence: _____

FACTS:

State here briefly the FACTS that support your case. Describe what happened, how you were harmed, and what each defendant personally did or failed to do that harmed you. Attach additional pages if needed.

INJURIES:

If you were injured as a result of these actions, describe your injuries and what medical treatment, if any, you required and received.

IV. RELIEF

State briefly what money damages or other relief you want the court to order.

V. PLAINTIFF'S CERTIFICATION AND WARNINGS

By signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that: (1) the complaint is not being presented for an improper purpose (such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation); (2) the claims are supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument to change existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the complaint otherwise complies with the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11.

I agree to notify the Clerk's Office in writing of any changes to my mailing address. I understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the Clerk's Office may result in the dismissal of my case.

Each Plaintiff must sign and date the complaint. Attach additional pages if necessary. If seeking to proceed without prepayment of fees, each plaintiff must also submit an IFP application.

| | | |
|------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| Dated | Plaintiff's Signature | |
| First Name | Middle Initial | Last Name |
| Street Address | | |
| County, City | State | Zip Code |
| Telephone Number | Email Address (if available) | |

I have read the Pro Se (Nonprisoner) Consent to Receive Documents Electronically:

Yes No

If you do consent to receive documents electronically, submit the completed form with your complaint. If you do not consent, please do not attach the form.

The NYLAG Legal Clinic for Pro Se Litigants in the Southern District of New York provides free limited legal assistance to individuals who are representing themselves or planning to represent themselves in civil lawsuits in federal court in Manhattan and White Plains. The clinic is staffed by attorneys, law students, and paralegals. Information given to clinic staff is confidential.

Clinic Staff Can:

- Advise on filing cases in federal court, including on the issue of whether a case should be filed in the Southern District of New York or somewhere else;
- Provide legal advice in response to questions that come up at any stage of litigation;
- Assist in getting additional information or research into the legal issue in your case;
- Review and explain court orders and filings by your opponent, and provide an overview of the federal legal process in civil cases generally;
- Assist with motions, discovery, and strategy;
- Assist with getting ready for depositions, pretrial conferences, mediations, and court appearances;
- Provide forms and instructions manuals;
- In appropriate cases, help you retain pro bono counsel;
- In appropriate cases, represent you in a mediation through the Southern District's Alternative Dispute Resolution Program, or a court-ordered settlement conference;
- In appropriate cases, represent you at a deposition; and
- In appropriate cases, provide referrals to other agencies and organizations that provide civil legal services and/or social services.

Clinic Staff Cannot:

- Assist with federal civil cases that belong in a different federal court, such as the Eastern District of New York, which covers of New York, which covers Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, and Nassau and Suffolk Counties;
- Assist with an appeal of your federal case;
- Assist with state court cases, bankruptcy court cases, or criminal cases;
- Pay any of the costs associated with filing or defending a lawsuit in federal court;
- File documents with the court on your behalf;
- Appear on your behalf other than representation at a mediation through the Southern District's Alternative Dispute Resolution Program, a court-ordered settlement conference, or, in appropriate cases, a deposition;
- Write court documents for you; or
- Conduct an investigation into the facts of your case.

Clinic Staff May Decline Assistance If:

- NYLAG has already given advice to your opponent;
- Your legal problem is beyond the scope of matters handled by the clinic;
- Providing assistance would conflict with the New York Rules of Professional Conduct;
- Your income and/or assets are high enough to allow you to retain private counsel; or
- NYLAG determines, in its professional legal judgement, that (i) you have refused to cooperate with the Clinic's counsel or follow the Clinic's advice; (ii) any assistance would be unreasonably difficult for NYLAG to carry out; or (iii) your case is or will become frivolous, unreasonable, groundless, or without merit.

Use of the NYLAG Legal Clinic for Pro Se Litigants is separate from any appointment of counsel by the court. A request for appointment of counsel requires a separate application and the decision whether to appoint counsel is entirely up to the court. Even if a litigant has consulted with Clinic staff, unless they retain other counsel and that counsel enters a notice of appearance, they remain unrepresented; are responsible for doing whatever is necessary in connection with the case; and must still submit all court papers to the Pro Se Intake Unit, located in Room 105 of the Daniel Patrick Moynihan Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, New York, New York, or by following the court's instructions for filing via email as a pro se litigant.